



City of Glendale, AZ

Consolidated Annual Performance and Evaluation Report (CAPER) Fiscal Year (FY) 2016-2017 Year 2



C • D • B • G

signs of progress • signs of success

CITY OF GLENDALE, AZ

CONSOLIDATED ANNUAL PERFORMANCE AND EVALUATION REPORT (CAPER)

Fiscal Year (FY) 2016-2017

Year 2

Prepared by:
City of Glendale, Arizona
Community Revitalization Division
Glendale City Hall
5850 West Glendale Avenue, Suite 107
Glendale, Arizona 85301

Phone (623) 930-3670
FAX (623) 435-8594
AZ Relay Service Number 711

Submitted to:
U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development
September 2016

TABLE OF CONTENTS

GENERAL

Executive Summary	1
General Questions	3
Managing the Process	6
Citizen Participation	6
Institutional Structure	7
Monitoring	8
Lead-based Paint	11

HOUSING

Housing Needs	11
Specific Housing Objectives	15
Public Housing Strategy	16
Barriers to Affordable Housing	17
HOME	18

HOMELESS

Homeless Needs	19
Specific Homeless Prevention Elements	20
Emergency Shelter Grants (ESG)	21

COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT

Community Development	23
Antipoverty Strategy	27

NON-HOMELESS SPECIAL NEEDS

Non-Homeless Special Needs	28
Specific HOPWA Objectives	28

OTHER NARRATIVE

Schedule of Reports	30
----------------------------	-----------



Second Program Year CAPER

The CPMP First Consolidated Annual Performance and Evaluation Report includes Narrative Responses to CAPER questions that CDBG, HOME, HOPWA, and ESG grantees must respond to each year in order to be compliant with the Consolidated Planning Regulations. The Executive Summary narratives are optional.

The grantee must submit an updated Financial Summary Report (PR26).

GENERAL

Executive Summary

This module is optional but encouraged. If you choose to complete it, provide a brief overview that includes major initiatives and highlights that were proposed and executed throughout the second year.

Program Year 2 CAPER Executive Summary response:

The City of Glendale continues its role as a leader in developing new or improving existing programs that provide Glendale citizens with affordable housing, viable neighborhoods and quality living environments. Community Development Block Grant (CDBG), Emergency Solutions Grants (ESG), and Home Investment Partnerships (HOME) Program funds are received from the U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD), to provide critical funding resources that make such programs possible.

At the beginning of each fiscal year (FY), Glendale prepares an Annual Action Plan that informs HUD and citizens of the goals and objectives Glendale intends to accomplish with CDBG, ESG, HOME, and other leveraged funds during that upcoming year. At the end of the fiscal year, Glendale prepares a Consolidated Annual Performance and Evaluation Report (CAPER) to illustrate the actual accomplishments achieved during that year. The CAPER allows HUD, local officials, and citizens to assess the use of available resources and to assess the efforts made to achieve the goals and objectives identified in Glendale's Consolidated Five-Year Plan and Annual Action Plan.

As an entitlement city, Glendale received CDBG and ESG funding directly from HUD. The CDBG entitlement for FY 2016-17 was \$2,200,786. In addition, Glendale's ESG entitlement was \$189,758 to fund ESG activities.

The CDBG program was designed to primarily assist low- and moderate-income individuals by providing affordable and decent housing, suitable living environments, revitalizing neighborhoods, and creating new employment opportunities through economic development.

The ESG program was created to assist with the prevention of homelessness, and to assist homeless individuals and families experiencing homelessness.

Glendale's HOME entitlement for FY 2016-2017 was \$514,115 and was distributed through the Maricopa HOME Consortium. Consortium members include Maricopa County, the cities of Glendale, Tempe, Scottsdale, Chandler, Peoria, Avondale, Surprise, and the Town of Gilbert. Maricopa County serves as the lead agency.

FY 2016-2017 ACCOMPLISHMENTS FUNDED WITH CDBG, ESG, AND HOME FUNDING

Program/Service	Quantity	Accomplishment	HUD Funds Expended
Housing Rehabilitation Activities	17	Homes Rehabilitated/Replaced (Rehabs/Exterior Improvements/Replacements)	534,035
	6	Lead-Based Paint/Hazard Test/Abatement with 1 property requiring mitigation	14,938
	170	Homes Repaired (8 Roofs & 145 Emergency Home Repairs)	582,947
	0	Code Enforcement (687 Code Enforcement Inspections)	70,485
New Homeownership Opportunities	7	Home Buyer Assistance and Single-Family Homes Acquired for Rehabilitation and Resold to Low-Income Families	171,011
Assistance to the Homeless	6143	Assistance to the homeless, Homeless Shelter or Intervention Assistance	270,456
Assistance to Persons with Special Needs	8	Provided Home Modifications for the Disabled	0
Economic Development , Public Facilities Improvements, and Public Infrastructure	7	Dilapidated Structures Demolished & Visual Improvement, and Clean and Lien Clearance	58,334
	0	Public Facility Renovations and Public Infrastructure Activities Completed; 14 in progress	779,978
	0	Public Housing or Rental Housing Renovations completed	0
	1	Public Housing or Rental Housing Renovations in progress (3 units at Cholla Vista)	133,016
Public Services	9,962	Individuals assisted via Public Service Providers	184,917
Fair Housing	161	Households Assisted	12,803
Total of Individuals Assisted	16,482	Total of individuals assisted	
Administration			351,435
Total HUD Funds / Program Income Expended			\$3,164,355

2973

Glendale is proud of the accomplishments illustrated in the sections to follow and will continue to utilize all available resources to improve the quality of life in our neighborhoods and community. A total of \$118,302 of CDBG program income from Single Family Rehabilitation Loan Repayments during FY 2016-2017 was entered into the Integrated Disbursements and Information System (IDIS), and was drawn down against expenditures encumbered during the year. Also, see the Maricopa HOME Consortium CAPER for reference to \$81,918 of HOME program income also earned and drawn down during the year. There was no program income in the ESG program.

In Program Year 2, Glendale has been able to use our federal appropriation to fund more than 15 different agencies and projects that benefit the Glendale community. These agencies leveraged an additional \$24,692,212 in outside funding sources, which in turn are used to provide service to thousands of Glendale residents. Some examples of the programs that assist low-moderate income persons would include funding local organizations such as the YWCA for congregate meals served to seniors and disabled individuals and home food delivery; Hope for Hunger emergency food box, Central Arizona Shelter Services, emergency shelter operations, and facility improvements. In addition to assisting various community service agencies, the Community Revitalization Division also assists with the removal of slum and blight. Through a combination of CDBG and HOME funds, the city has been able to work with non-profit developers such as Habitat for Humanity, to provide funding to construct new

single-family housing. This area includes the city's Downtown Redevelopment Target Area (DRTA) as highlighted in the City Center Master Plan.

General Questions

1. Assessment of the one-year goals and objectives:
 - a. Describe the accomplishments in attaining the goals and objectives for the reporting period.
 - b. Provide a breakdown of the CPD formula grant funds spent on grant activities for each goal and objective.
 - c. If applicable, explain why progress was not made towards meeting the goals and objectives.
2. Describe the manner in which the recipient would change its program as a result of its experiences.
3. Affirmatively Furthering Fair Housing:
 - a. Provide a summary of impediments to fair housing choice.
 - b. Identify actions taken to overcome effects of impediments identified.
4. Describe Other Actions in Strategic Plan or Action Plan taken to address obstacles to meeting underserved needs.
5. Leveraging Resources
 - a. Identify progress in obtaining "other" public and private resources to address needs.
 - b. How Federal resources from HUD leveraged other public and private resources.
 - c. How matching requirements were satisfied.

Program Year 2 CAPER General Questions response:

1. See Exhibit 1 OBJECTIVES & OUTCOMES for accomplishments in attaining the goals and objectives for Fiscal Year 2016-2017.

2. The programs are reviewed each year by the Community Development Advisory Committee (CDAC), a group of volunteer citizens appointed from the Council Districts throughout Glendale. Priorities are reviewed to make adjustments in programs and projects that are necessary for meeting the established Five-Year Plan. If adjustments need to be made due to current conditions, such as finding a way to bridge the affordability gap for new homeowners, the CDAC/staff addresses the priorities and goals that might need to be changed.

3. Fair Housing is a shared concern regionally and locally, as illustrated in Glendale's Five-Year Consolidated Plan. Glendale completed the Analysis of Impediments (AI) to Fair Housing Choice in June 2015. The analysis identifies barriers to fair housing choice, to prevent and address discriminatory housing practices based on race, color, national origin, sex, religion, disability, and familial status. In this past year, Glendale continued to implement a three-pronged strategy to eliminate fair housing barriers by providing or supporting Advocacy, Education, and Enforcement.

ASK Development Solutions, Inc. based in Southfield, Michigan prepared Glendale's update to the Analysis of Impediments (AI) to Fair Housing Choice. The analysis identifies barriers to free and unencumbered choice of and access to housing.

The table below describes the programs that were supported to perpetuate Fair Housing through advocacy, education, and enforcement of Fair Housing statutes.

Advocacy	Newspaper: Glendale continues to advertise fair housing assistance and services by publishing non-legal notices, in Spanish and English, each month in a local newspaper of general circulation.
	Outreach Literature: Fair-housing posters are prominently displayed in locations within municipal facilities and at subrecipient locations.
	Program Subrecipients: Subrecipients funded under the CDBG, ESG, and HOME programs are required to comply with fair housing requirements.
	City Web Site: Glendale's web page offers links to several web sites to assist low-/moderate-income families and individuals. Two Divisions within Community Partnerships provide references to fair housing web sites – one in Community Revitalization and one in Housing. From there, information is available regarding rights and the process for filing complaints.
Education	Legal Assistance and Counseling Assistance: Glendale contracted with Community Legal Services to provide legal assistance, outreach and training to educate private and public sector housing practitioners. This agency conducts workshops on issues related to fair housing.
	Counseling Assistance: Community Housing Services counsels and assists Section 8 tenants to locate outside areas of poverty and minority concentrations. The Section 8 program is also marketed to rental property owners and managers throughout Glendale to avoid centralization.
Enforcement of Fair Housing Statutes	Legal Counseling Assistance: Community Legal Services provides direct representation and litigates on behalf of its Glendale clients with Fair Housing claims in courts and through the Arizona Attorney General's administrative Fair Housing complaint process.
	Testing for Housing Discrimination: The Arizona Department of Real Estate is charged with testing for housing discrimination throughout the state.

4. The steps taken by the City of Glendale to address obstacles that face the underserved in the community are increased funding to provide homeless prevention and rapid re-housing. This funding provides assistance with rent payment and utility assistance to individuals as well as focusing on providing funding to assist the homeless population in acquiring a suitable living environment.

The OBJECTIVES AND OUTCOMES table (Exhibit 1, attached) documents the grant funds spent on activities to address the goal of decent housing and the objective of affordability. We continue to partner with other departments like the Community Action Program and participate with the Maricopa County Continuum of Care to address underserved needs.

Glendale just completed the new Analysis of Impediments (AI) to Fair Housing Choice in June 2015. The plan addresses 2016 impediments and recommendations.

5. Leveraging Resources: The table "LEVERAGING RESOURCES FOR FY 2016-2017" (below) provides a summary of federal, state, county, local, and other public and private resources that were made available during FY 2016-2017 to assist Glendale in achieving the goals and objectives contained in the FY 2015-2019 Five-Year Consolidated Plan. Where a match is

required, each agency is required to identify the non-federal resources utilized to meet those requirements.

LEVERAGING RESOURCES FOR FY 2015-2016				
FUNDING SOURCE	Proposed Amount	Proposed Subtotals	Actual Amount	Actual Subtotals
A. FEDERAL FUNDS				
1. CDBG	2,200,786		2,722,922	
2. HOME Program	514,115		352,499	
3. ESG	189,758		152,470	
4. HUD Low Rent Public Housing	598,101		598,101	
5. HUD Section 8 Vouchers & Certificates	8,563,735		8,563,735	
6. HUD Capital Fund Program	204,103		204,103	
7. Other Programs	0		0	
		\$12,270,598		\$12,593,830
B. STATE FUNDS				
1. LIHEAP & Other Emergency Programs (CAP)	0		0	
		0		0
C. LOCAL GENERAL FUNDS (City of Glendale)				
1. Community Action Program (CAP) (COG)	0		0	
2. Community Housing Services (COG)	386,563		386,563	
3. Code Compliance (COG)	0		0	
4. Community Revitalization (COG)	0		0	
5. Maricopa County HOME Consortium Match	78,572		78,572	
		\$465,135		\$465,135
D. PRIVATE FUNDS				
1. Community Revitalization Program Income (COG)	125,372		125,372	
2. Operating Receipts from Community Housing Rents	354,056		354,056	
3. Arizona Community Action Association	0		0	
		\$479,428		\$479,428
E. LEVERAGED FUNDS – NON PROFITS				
1. CDBG - Public Services	10,316,187		10,056,288	
2. CDBG - Physical Improvements	11,532,366		7,188,467	
3. HOME	3,824,424		3,300,590	
4. ESG	6,325,267		4,879,166	
		\$31,998,244		\$25,424,511
Totals		\$45,213,406		\$38,962,904

Managing the Process

1. Describe actions taken during the last year to ensure compliance with program and comprehensive planning requirements.

Program Year 2 CAPER Managing the Process response:

The Community Revitalization Division monitors progress, prepares the Annual Action Plan and CAPER, assists the CDAC in their evaluation of applications, and addresses administrative and regulatory issues. As a member of the HOME Consortium, the Division also shares responsibility for peer monitoring of other HOME Consortium members and in turn is monitored by those peers.

The Division is responsible for planning and reporting on projects and services that are provided by non-profit agencies, other city departments, and other governments.

Also, see the Maricopa HOME Consortium CAPER for reference to the HOME process management.

Citizen Participation

1. Provide a summary of citizen comments.
2. In addition, the performance report provided to citizens must identify the Federal funds made available for furthering the objectives of the Consolidated Plan. For each formula grant program, the grantee shall identify the total amount of funds available (including estimated program income), the total amount of funds committed during the reporting period, the total amount expended during the reporting period, and the geographic distribution and location of expenditures. Jurisdictions are encouraged to include maps in describing the geographic distribution and location of investment (including areas of minority concentration). The geographic distribution and expenditure requirement may also be satisfied by specifying the census tracts where expenditures were concentrated.

*Please note that Citizen Comments and Responses may be included as additional files within the CPMP Tool.

Program Year 2 CAPER Citizen Participation response:

1. An integral component of the development of the Consolidated Annual Performance and Evaluation Report (CAPER) is providing citizens with an opportunity to review and comment on the CAPER. A public notice, announcing the public review and comment period for the CAPER, was published in The Glendale Star on August 31 and September 7, 2017. (See next page.)

The public notice informed citizens of the review and comment period, which ran from September 1, 2017 thru September 15, 2017 (minimum 15-days). The notice provided information regarding the locations where the CAPER would be available for public review, and advised citizens where comments should be directed.

Listed below are the locations where the CAPER was made available for citizen review:

FY 2016-2017 Consolidated Annual Performance and Evaluation Report (CAPER) Public Review and Comment Period 9/1/17 - 9/15/17	
Public Building	Address
Community Revitalization Division	5850 W. Glendale Avenue, Suite 107 Glendale, Arizona
Community Housing Administrative Office	6842 N. 61 st Avenue Glendale, Arizona
Velma Teague Library	7010 N. 58 th Avenue Glendale, Arizona
Glendale Main Library	5959 W. Brown Street Glendale, Arizona
Foothills Library	19055 N. 57 th Avenue Glendale, Arizona

The DRAFT CAPER was also posted on the Community Revitalization web page:
<http://www.glendaleaz.com/communityrevitalization/Plansandassessments.cfm>

In addition to accepting comments at the Community Revitalization Division office by mail and by fax, an e-mail address was provided for public input at: Con-Plan@glendaleaz.com

Further, an e-mail list is maintained which includes all non-profit agencies that are currently providing services, or had done so previously. An announcement was sent via e-mail to make our non-profit partners aware that the CAPER was available for review, as well.

2. Please see Exhibit 1 OBJECTIVES & OUTCOMES for accomplishments in attaining the goals and objectives for Fiscal Year 2016-2017.

The City of Glendale identified low-to-moderate-income target areas where more than 51% of the population are households with incomes at 80% of the Area Median Income as defined and adjusted annually by HUD. However, for the most part, the City does not direct its assistance based on those target areas. The Census Tracts, 85301 and 85302, which contain a higher concentration of low/mod income persons are 924, 925, 926.01, 926.02, 926.05, 927.15, 927.17, 927.18, 928, 930.01, and 930.02. The CDBG, ESG, and HOME regulations allow for resources to be allocated based on the income characteristics of beneficiaries. As such, the City allocated its resources for public service activities, affordable housing, and emergency home repair citywide. CDBG and ESG funding allocations for public service were allocated on a city-wide basis.

CDBG funded public facilities and infrastructure improvement activities were located in the City's low-to-moderate-income census tracts if they met an area benefit national objective. Such activities were carried out in the target areas and the city's Downtown Redevelopment Target Area (DRTA), as adopted by the City Council. For those areas in which CDBG funding provided an area benefit, 19% of the available funding for FY 2016-2017 including reprogramming funds was planned to be allocated with the actual allocation finally being 73%.

CDBG funded public facilities and infrastructure improvement activities were also carried out in non-designated areas. Such public facilities and improvement activities benefitted limited clientele (special needs) populations.

Generally, allocation of funds are not based on geographic priorities except in the case

where an area benefit national objective is used under the CDBG program.

Institutional Structure

1. Describe actions taken during the last year to overcome gaps in institutional structures and enhance coordination.

Program Year 2 CAPER Institutional Structure response:

IMPROVE INSTITUTIONAL STRUCTURE AND ENHANCE COORDINATION

Glendale initiated a variety of enhancements to critical processes, such as our overall environmental review process, monitoring process, and capacity.

Glendale also emphasizes a team approach to problem solving and places a high priority on developing strategic partnerships and strong communication networks. The table below provides a list of Glendale's strategic partnerships and networks. For a detailed summary of the partnerships and networks, please refer to the Glendale FY 2016-2017 Annual Action Plan.

Glendale Strategic Partnerships & Networks	
Community Development Advisory Committee (CDAC)	Glendale Police Community Action Teams (CAT)
Community Volunteer Program	Maricopa HOME Consortium
Glendale University	Intergovernmental Coordination
Maricopa Association of Governments (MAG)	

Monitoring

1. Describe how and the frequency with which you monitored your activities.
2. Describe the results of your monitoring including any improvements.
3. Self Evaluation
 - a. Describe the effect programs have in solving neighborhood and community problems.
 - b. Describe progress in meeting priority needs and specific objectives and help make community's vision of the future a reality.
 - c. Describe how you provided decent housing and a suitable living environment and expanded economic opportunity principally for low and moderate-income persons.
 - d. Indicate any activities falling behind schedule.
 - e. Describe how activities and strategies made an impact on identified needs.
 - f. Identify indicators that would best describe the results.
 - g. Identify barriers that had a negative impact on fulfilling the strategies and overall vision.
 - h. Identify whether major goals are on target and discuss reasons for those that are not on target.
 - i. Identify any adjustments or improvements to strategies and activities that might meet your needs more effectively.

Program Year 2 CAPER Monitoring response:

Procedures have been established to monitor subrecipients with formal monitoring visits each year. Monitoring visits were conducted on-site whenever feasible. Selection of the agencies to be monitored was based on a risk analysis prior to determining which agencies to monitor. Six on-site monitoring visits and two technical assistance visits were completed during FY 2016-2017. In addition, technical assistance was provided to the other agencies that were not monitored during the year.

Monitoring visits are conducted in accordance with the updated monitoring and compliance guidebook published by HUD. A standardized monitoring guide, created by the Maricopa HOME Consortium, is also followed in evaluating subrecipient performance, and the results of the monitoring visits are documented in a written report addressed to the subrecipient agency. Where findings, concerns or suggestions have been identified, we worked with the agencies to eliminate issues. In addition, where applicable, a follow-up monitoring or technical session was scheduled. There were no findings of significant impact issues during the fiscal year.

Self-Evaluation: The current state of the economy continues to impact our community. The goal of the community planning and development programs, as identified in the Five-Year Consolidated Plan, is to continue to develop viable communities by providing decent housing, a suitable living environment, and economic opportunities for low- and moderate-income individuals. During FY 2016-2017, the City of Glendale continued to fund activities and implement strategies that had a significant impact on achieving these goals. The accomplishments illustrated in the OBJECTIVES AND OUTCOMES table (Exhibit 1, attached), clearly indicate that:

- ☐ Glendale neighborhood housing stock has been substantially improved and rehabilitated;
- ☐ Glendale neighborhood streetscapes have been improved and are safer and more aesthetically pleasing;
- ☐ Additional low-income families have an opportunity to own their own homes through a variety of programs, including acquisition rehabilitation, infill housing, etc.;
- ☐ Homeless prevention continues to be the most effective method of addressing the issue of homelessness, and complements other related critical services;
- ☐ Thousands of individuals and families are receiving critically-needed public services that improve their quality of life;
- ☐ Disabled citizens have increased access within their own homes, and to Glendale public spaces and facilities; and
- ☐ Newly renovated public facilities improve the delivery of programs and services and also create aesthetic and social accents in the community.

CDBG and HOME programs are popular and effective programs that continue to be in great demand, especially with the current economic conditions. Each activity, program, and project is monitored on a continual basis following internal review procedures to ensure effectiveness. When challenges are encountered or change is needed, the cause is assessed and adjustments are made. In FY 2016-2017, project savings and other funds were reprogrammed through the public process to address funding shortfalls and get the funds back out into the community as soon as possible. This was done within the confines of our Five-Year Citizen Participation Plan. Funding from the Housing Rehabilitation Program was reallocated within the program umbrella to address a variety of housing rehabilitation related demands and to get the federal funds out to the community as quickly and efficiently as possible.

The CDAC made funding recommendations towards the homeless prevention and rapid re-housing programs and the operational costs of homeless service activities with ESG funds

along with other federal funds. They also helped fund existing shelters and address related homelessness issues while maintaining our focus on prevention.

Glendale is an active partner on the MAG Continuum of Care Regional Committee on Homelessness. The Committee is focused on the review and update of its policies and procedures to assure regulatory compliance and ensure that limited resources are used effectively and efficiently. If impediments are identified, staff will research options for management consideration and implement changes.

Grant disbursements continue to occur timely. Program expenditures do not differ from the letter of credit disbursements, because city resources are used to fund program activities, and the subsequent letter of credit drawdowns occur on a reimbursement basis. Glendale continues to utilize innovation to improve the grants application process, such as the ongoing use of the United Way's e-CImpact online application system to streamline the process and provide better access to our non-profit partners. Glendale continues to meet or exceed its timeliness test each year as mandated by regulation.

While we continue to meet or exceed most of our goals and objectives, there continues to be challenges that impact our programs. The current effects on the downturn in the housing market is negatively impacting neighborhoods and making it very difficult for first time homebuyers to secure mortgages. Staff continues to work with other departments in addressing challenges related to properties falling under their regulatory jurisdiction, especially historical properties, in the area of historic preservation. We have changed the financial structure of the loans we provide to accommodate the increased costs associated with Housing Rehabilitation projects.

The environmental clearance process has been streamlined and has positively impacted the timeliness of projects. Staff has continued environmental regulatory training to ensure compliance, help update procedures, regulatory interpretations, and to utilize the latest clearance documentation. In June 2009, an Intergovernmental Programmatic Agreement was signed by the City of Glendale, State Historic Preservation Department, and Maricopa County Consortium. An update to this Agreement was executed in 2016. This agreement eliminates the need for the State Preservation Office review for the potential historic effect on a project. The responsibility for this review is now done with qualified Community Revitalization staff in conjunction with the City of Glendale's Historic Preservation Officer. The programmatic agreement is designed to approach all projects that might have or that might be considered to have a level of historic significance. The choices of material and construction techniques are to be developed with preservation in mind when economically feasible. The Division works closely with our Historic Preservation Liaison and attends the Historic Preservation Committee meetings as requested. The Planner/Liaison assigned to historic preservation is consulted as needed. In cases where we are dealing with very unique historical property, we will acquire the services of architects recognized as experts in the historical arena as recommended by our Planning Department and other stakeholders. Glendale continues to contract with an outside consultant to assist us with the annual programmatic clearance process and the first tier clearance of our physical improvement projects. This has enabled us to redistribute limited staff time to create efficiency in the overall grant administration process.

Glendale conducts an extensive public participation process for the allocation of federal funds. This process involves a review of community needs and input from a variety of stakeholders and partners. As in any community, Glendale has infinite needs and finite resources to address them. To ensure Glendale's federal allocations are serving locally identified needs and to ensure HUD's investment is leveraged to the highest efficiency, the Community Revitalization Division, in conjunction with the CDAC, continues reviewing the amount of the federal allocations to partner agencies, working with them to focus on efficiency and outcomes.

Staff continues their effort to increase our current level of technical assistance and monitoring of partner agencies. Overall, agencies were providing good value to the citizens of Glendale and any issues were identified and addressed.

Our team continues to communicate with private financial institutions, such as banks and non-profit mortgage companies, to identify and pursue financial partnership opportunities. In today's tight credit market, these partnerships will allow us to leverage existing project funds, refinance existing debt by providing a lower finance rate with non-federal funds, resulting in assistance to more families and the replacement of existing predatory type loans.

We work diligently to ensure our partner agencies have access to as many resources as possible, so they can make a positive impact on our community and federal funding is leveraged to its highest potential.

Lead-based Paint

1. Describe actions taken during the last year to evaluate and reduce lead-based paint hazards.

Program Year 2 CAPER Lead-based Paint response:

Lead-Based Paint Regulations

The U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD) has regulations to protect children from the hazards of lead-based paint in federally funded projects. HUD continues to provide training for compliance with these regulations. Staff from Glendale's Community Revitalization Division has attended training and is currently in compliance with these regulations. In addition, Glendale continues to provide required notice and information to all program participants of the hazards posed by lead paint. All pre-1978 housing units are tested for lead content prior to any rehabilitation program assistance.

In FY 2016-2017 Glendale allocated CDBG funding for the reduction of lead-based paint hazards in single-family homes rehabilitated under the Residential Rehabilitation Programs. With the use of \$14,938 of CDBG funding, six (6) lead-based paint assessments were conducted and only one required mitigation, a residential property.

HOUSING

Housing Needs

1. Describe Actions taken during the last year to foster and maintain affordable housing.

Program Year 2 CAPER Housing Needs response:

<u>Housing Needs - Comprehensive Housing</u>	Current % of	Current Num					
			Year 1	Year 2	Year 3	Year 4	Year 5

<u>Affordability Strategy (CHAS) Data Housing Problems</u>				Households	Number of Households	Goal	Actual	Goal	Actual	Goal	Actual	Goal	Actual	Goals	Actual
Household Income <=30% MFI	Renter	Elderly	NUMBER OF HOUSEHOLDS												
			<u>Any housing problems</u>			147	959	145	902	0	0	0	0	0	0
			<u>Cost Burden > 30%</u>												
			Cost Burden >50%												
		Small Related	NUMBER OF HOUSEHOLDS												
			With Any Housing Problems			29	0	25	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
			Cost Burden > 30%												
			Cost Burden >50%												
		Large Related	NUMBER OF HOUSEHOLDS												
			With Any Housing Problems			29	0	25	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
			Cost Burden > 30%												
			Cost Burden >50%												
		All other hsholds	NUMBER OF HOUSEHOLDS												
			With Any Housing Problems			29	800	25	788	0	0	0	0	0	0
			Cost Burden > 30%												
			Cost Burden >50%												
	Owner	Elderly	NUMBER OF HOUSEHOLDS												
			With Any Housing Problems			39	20	35	22	0	0	0	0	0	0
			Cost Burden > 30%												
			Cost Burden >50%												
		Small Related	NUMBER OF HOUSEHOLDS												
			With Any Housing Problems			42	3	40	5	0	0	0	0	0	0
			Cost Burden > 30%												
			Cost Burden >50%												
		Large Related	NUMBER OF HOUSEHOLDS												
			With Any Housing Problems			42	5	40	7	0	0	0	0	0	0
			Cost Burden > 30%												
			Cost Burden >50%												
		All	NUMBER OF HOUSEHOLDS												

Household Income >30 to <=50% MFI	Renter		With Any Housing Problems			39	144	45	138	0	0	0	0	0	0
			Cost Burden > 30%												
			Cost Burden >50%												
		Elderly	NUMBER OF HOUSEHOLDS												
			With Any Housing Problems			46	0	40	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
			Cost Burden > 30%												
			Cost Burden >50%												
		Small Related	NUMBER OF HOUSEHOLDS												
			With Any Housing Problems			9	0	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
			Cost Burden > 30%												
			Cost Burden >50%												
		Large Related	NUMBER OF HOUSEHOLDS												
			With Any Housing Problems			9	0	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
			Cost Burden > 30%												
			Cost Burden >50%												
		All other hsholds	NUMBER OF HOUSEHOLDS												
			With Any Housing Problems			9	0	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
			Cost Burden > 30%												
			Cost Burden >50%												
	Owner	Elderly	NUMBER OF HOUSEHOLDS												
			With Any Housing Problems			51	31	50	26	0	0	0	0	0	0
			Cost Burden > 30%												
			Cost Burden >50%												
		Small Related	NUMBER OF HOUSEHOLDS												
			With Any Housing Problems			51	14	50	23	0	0	0	0	0	0
			Cost Burden > 30%												
			Cost Burden >50%												
		Large Related	NUMBER OF HOUSEHOLDS												
			With Any Housing Problems			51	6	50	9	0	0	0	0	0	0
			Cost Burden > 30%												
			Cost Burden >50%												

Household Income >50 to <=80% MFI	All other hsholds	NUMBER OF HOUSEHOLDS												
		With Any Housing Problems			51	76	50	67	0	0	0	0	0	0
		Cost Burden > 30%												
		Cost Burden >50%												
	Elderly	NUMBER OF HOUSEHOLDS												
		With Any Housing Problems			0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
		Cost Burden > 30%												
		Cost Burden >50%												
	Small Related	NUMBER OF HOUSEHOLDS												
		With Any Housing Problems			0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
		Cost Burden > 30%												
		Cost Burden >50%												
	Large Related	NUMBER OF HOUSEHOLDS												
		With Any Housing Problems			0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
		Cost Burden > 30%												
		Cost Burden >50%												
	All other hsholds	NUMBER OF HOUSEHOLDS												
		With Any Housing Problems			0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
		Cost Burden > 30%												
		Cost Burden >50%												
	Elderly	NUMBER OF HOUSEHOLDS												
		With Any Housing Problems			23	16	20	15	0	0	0	0	0	0
		Cost Burden > 30%												
		Cost Burden >50%												
	Small Related	NUMBER OF HOUSEHOLDS												
		With Any Housing Problems			23	19	20	18	0	0	0	0	0	0
		Cost Burden > 30%												
		Cost Burden >50%												
	Large Related	NUMBER OF HOUSEHOLDS												
		With Any Housing Problems			23	24	20	23	0	0	0	0	0	0
		Cost Burden > 30%												

All other hsholds	Cost Burden >50%												
	NUMBER OF HOUSEHOLDS												
	With Any Housing Problems			23	31	20	26	0	0	0	0	0	0
	Cost Burden > 30%												
	Cost Burden >50%												
	Total Any Housing Problem												
	Total 215 Renter												
	Total 215 Owner												
	Total 215												

Specific Housing Objectives

1. Evaluate progress in meeting specific objectives of providing affordable housing, including the number of extremely low-income, low-income, and moderate-income renter and owner households comparing actual accomplishments with proposed goals during the reporting period.
2. Evaluate progress in providing affordable housing that meets the Section 215 definition of affordable housing for rental and owner households comparing actual accomplishments with proposed goals during the reporting period.
3. Describe efforts to address "worst-case" housing needs and housing needs of persons with disabilities.

Program Year 2 CAPER Specific Housing Objectives response:

The OBJECTIVES AND OUTCOMES table (Exhibit 1, attached) details the goals proposed and completed, as well as the dollar amounts committed and expended for each of the resources used for this purpose.

As listed in Glendale's Five-Year Consolidated Plan FY 2015-2019 (Executive Summary, Pages 6 through 11), Glendale's Housing Goals and Objectives include the following: Specific performance measures (e.g., number of households assisted and units produced) appear at the end of this section and in the required HUD tables.

City of Glendale Housing Goals and Objectives

FIVE-YEAR HOUSING PLAN GOALS AND OBJECTIVES	
<u>STRATEGY 1: PROVIDE HOMELESS SUPPORT SERVICES ACROSS THE ENTIRE SPECTRUM OF NEED, FROM HOMELESSNESS TO SELF-SUFFICIENCY, WITH THE CONTINUED EMPHASIS ON HOMELESS PREVENTION</u>	
Goal 1: Continue to support existing emergency shelters that meet established performance measures.	
Goal 2: Continue to provide shelter and supportive services to persons who are homeless, including victims of domestic violence.	

Goal 3: Assist persons who are homeless in the transition to permanent housing.

Goal 4: Provide emergency assistance and counseling to households at-risk of homelessness.

Goal 5: Support the Maricopa Continuum of Care and countywide non-profits that provide services to persons who are homeless, including chronically homeless.

STRATEGY 2: INCREASE THE VARIETY AND AMOUNT OF HOUSING STOCK THAT ACCOMMODATES SENIORS AND PERSONS WITH DISABILITIES

Goal 1: Provide accessibility improvements to allow seniors and persons with disabilities to live independently in their own homes.

Goal 2: Continue efforts to develop diverse housing products for seniors and persons with disabilities.

Goal 3: Encourage the increased use of universal design and visibility standards in new construction.

STRATEGY 3: INCREASE THE AVAILABILITY OF AFFORDABLE, QUALITY HOUSING STOCK

Goal 1: Continue to utilize private and non-profit partners to provide financial services that leverage federal resources (i.e., a revolving loan fund program).

Goal 2: Improve and preserve existing housing stock through rehabilitation and emergency repairs and home improvement programs.

Goal 3: Support the Public Housing Authority's capital improvement needs, resident initiatives and supportive services.

Goal 4: Continue strong code enforcement and monitoring of substandard, multi-family properties.

Goal 5: Reduce the number of single-family homes with lead-based paint risk through the City's Housing Rehabilitation Program.

Goal 6: Facilitate the demolition and/or clearance of substandard structures that will allow for future development benefiting low- to moderate-income households and to assist in the removal of slum and blight.

Goal 7: Consider funding applications for aging multi-family properties in need of rehabilitation. The properties assisted would be required to enact and maintain a crime-free, drug-free policy or similar program.

STRATEGY 4: INCREASE HOMEOWNERSHIP

Goal 1: Support the City's public housing efforts to move participants into homeownership.

Goal 2: Provide or identify sources for down payment assistance and related costs to qualified first-time homebuyers, to increase homeownership.

Goal 3: Support land acquisition, infrastructure development, property acquisition, and rehabilitation programs related to development of affordable single-family housing.

State funds – Glendale utilized funds from the state Low-Income Home Energy Assistance Program (LIHEAP) to assist low-income households.

County funds – Glendale's Community Action Program (CAP) received funding under federal self-sufficiency programs that are administered by Maricopa County.

City funds – Glendale dedicated over \$3 million to fund internal housing and community development activities related to public housing provision, code compliance, neighborhood revitalization, housing revitalization, and self-sufficiency programs. This includes funding for emergency shelter operations, homeless prevention activities, affordable housing development, and food services.

Private funds – A variety of private funds were leveraged for housing and community development activities. These range from donations on behalf of Glendale residents (through utility bill contributions), public housing unit rental revenue, project proceeds, matching funds, and private donor contributions.

The table, LEVERAGING RESOURCES FOR FY 2016-2017, detailing the dollar amounts of each of these resources appears in the Executive Summary, item 5, Leveraging Resources.

Public Housing Strategy

1. Describe actions taken during the last year to improve public housing and resident initiatives.

Program Year 2 CAPER Public Housing Strategy response:

During FY 2016-2017, the Housing Authority received CDBG funding to address rehabilitation needs. Glendale Public Housing Authority continues to be recognized as a high performer by HUD.

Below is a table that summarizes funding provided in support of Public Housing during FY 2016-2017.

Public Housing Strategy								
Local Housing Agency	Funding Source	Amount:	# of Resident Councils	Amount ROSS Grants	CIP \$ Amount	Family Self-Sufficiency Graduates	Family Self-Sufficiency Escrow Fund Total 16/17 Payouts	Home-buyer Voucher Subsidy
Glendale	HUD		0	0	\$204,103	0	0	0
	CDBG					0	0	0
	HUD							
	HUD (Section 8)	\$8,563,735				0	0	\$13,477

Barriers to Affordable Housing

1. Describe actions taken during the last year to eliminate barriers to affordable housing.

Program Year 2 CAPER Barriers to Affordable Housing response:

Glendale continues to address obstacles to eliminate barriers to affordable housing in the community. Please refer to the OBJECTIVES AND OUTCOMES table (Exhibit 1, attached).

HOME

1. Assessment of Relationship of HOME Funds to Goals and Objectives
 - a. Evaluate progress made toward meeting goals for providing affordable housing using HOME funds, including the number and types of households served.
2. HOME Match Report
 - a. Use HOME Match Report HUD-40107-A to report on match contributions for the period covered by the Consolidated Plan program year.
3. HOME MBE and WBE Report
 - a. Use Part III of HUD Form 40107 to report contracts and subcontracts with Minority Business Enterprises (MBEs) and Women's Business Enterprises (WBEs).
4. Assessments
 - a. Detail results of on-site inspections of rental housing.
 - b. Describe the HOME jurisdiction's affirmative marketing actions.
 - c. Describe outreach to minority and women owned businesses.

Program Year 2 CAPER HOME response:

The table below describes the relationship between expenditures and the number of units assisted through HOME. Also see OBJECTIVES AND OUTCOMES table (Exhibit 1, attached).

HOME		
Projects	Spent	# Units
Housing Rehab (Replacement, Single Family Rehab)	\$161,338	3
Home-New Homeownership	\$171,011	7
Land Acquisition – Rental Housing	0	0
Administration	\$20,150	
<i>Subtotal HOME Funding</i>	<i>\$ 352,499</i>	<i>10</i>
PI	0	
Matching Funds	\$78,572	
Total HOME Funding Expended during FY 2016-2017	\$431,071	10
FY 2016-2017 HOME allocation	\$514,115	

Please refer to the Maricopa HOME Consortium CAPER for the HOME Match Report, the Minority Business Enterprises and Women-Owned Business Enterprise Report (MBE/WBE)

(HUD-40107 Part III), and assessments regarding: inspections, affirmative marketing, and outreach to minority and women owned businesses.

HOMELESS

Homeless Needs

1. Identify actions taken to address needs of homeless persons.
2. Identify actions to help homeless persons make the transition to permanent housing and independent living.
3. Identify new Federal resources obtained from Homeless SuperNOFA.

Program Year 2 CAPER Homeless Needs response:

Please see the OBJECTIVES AND OUTCOMES table (Exhibit 1, attached) for details on the goals proposed and completed, as well as the dollar amounts committed and expended for this purpose. Further, see the table at the end of this section which summarizes commitments by funding source. The primary sources of funding the City of Glendale made available for programs that assist the homeless are CDBG, ESG, and Continuum of Care grants through participation in the Maricopa County Continuum of Care process. The City of Glendale allocated \$144,111 of CDBG funding and \$189,758 of ESG Funds in FY 2016-2017 toward programs to assist persons who are homeless or who are at imminent risk of homelessness. Together, these funds benefited over 5,000 individuals. The funds were used for transitional housing support, emergency assistance, counseling, and shelter operations. The largest obstacle is the availability of funding. The tables below outline these activities by funding source and the organizations funded. Glendale continues to participate and financially support organizations involved in the Maricopa Continuum of Care process. The Continuum has adopted a Plan to End Chronic Homelessness and is monitoring its progress in achieving the goals. As an inner-ring suburb with fewer homeless services and needs than metropolitan Phoenix, Glendale's most effective role in ending chronic homelessness is to lend financial support to organizations in the Continuum, provide ESG funding to shelters in Glendale, and work to prevent additional homelessness through homeless prevention programs. The city continued to participate and financially support organizations involved in the Maricopa Continuum of Care process.

CDBG FY 2016-2017 FUNDING ALLOCATIONS FOR PUBLIC SERVICES ACTIVITIES

Agency	Activity Name	Annual Action Plan Goals	Goals Achieved	CDBG Funding Expended
Homeless				
COG Community Action Program (CAP)	Eviction Prevention	65-Individuals	223-Individuals	\$61,438
Society of St. Vincent de Paul, OLPH	Keeping Families Together	320-Individuals	309-Individuals	\$62,643
TOTAL CDBG FUNDING FOR HOMELESS ASSISTANCE ACTIVITIES				\$124,081

ESG FY 2016-2017 FUNDING ALLOCATIONS HOMELESS ASSISTANCE ACTIVITIES				
Operational Costs for Homeless Service Activities				
Agency	Activity Name	Annual Action Plan Goals	Goals Achieved	ESG Funding Expended
A New Leaf	Faith House Emergency Shelter	79-Individuals	188-Individuals	\$47,691
Streetlight USA	Shelter Operating Costs - Utilities	184-Individuals	76-Individuals	\$10,232
UMOM New Day Centers, Inc.	Emergency Shelter for Families	68-Individuals	49-Individuals	\$25,581
A New Leaf	Rapid-Re-housing Program	89-Individuals	35-Individuals	\$30,989
Central Arizona Shelter Services (CASS)	Rapid-Re-housing Program	17-Individuals	14-Individuals	\$29,930
City of Glendale Community Action Program	Rapid-Re-housing Program	41-Individuals	2-Individuals	\$1,951
TOTAL ESG FUNDING FOR HOMELESS ASSISTANCE ACTIVITIES				\$146,374

Specific Homeless Prevention Elements

1. Identify actions taken to prevent homelessness.

Program Year 2 CAPER Specific Homeless Prevention Elements response:

Glendale continues to dedicate CDBG and ESG funds to homeless prevention activities which include emergency rent/utility assistance, counseling, and referral services. Also, the maximum stay allowed in the city's lock-up is 48 hours, after which detainees are transferred to the County Jail located in downtown Phoenix. We look to our non-profit partners for assistance in transitioning people who need help after being discharged from these type of facilities. Located in downtown Phoenix, Central Arizona Shelter Services (CASS), is one of those partners. Further, our Police Department has a policy that juveniles need to be released to a responsible party.

In addition, Project H3: (Home, Health, Hope), is a collaborative effort of community leaders from the non-profit, governmental, and business communities in the Greater Phoenix area striving to end homelessness in our communities.

Project H3 is led by the Arizona Coalition to End Homelessness and supported by over 30 agencies, organizations, and entities.

Federal regulations allow a housing authority to:

- Adopt a preference for admission of single persons who are age 62 or older, displaced, homeless, or persons with disabilities, over other single persons.
 - Publish a public notice stating any limitations on who may apply for available slots in the program.
 - Adopt criteria defining which families may apply for assistance under a public notice.
1. In April 2010, Glendale Community Housing Division participated in the H3 (Home, Health, Hope) Initiative, whose main goal is to provide permanent supportive housing for the 50 most medically vulnerable homeless persons throughout the valley. Glendale Housing received permission from HUD to dedicate five Section 8 Housing Choice Vouchers to the H3 homeless pilot program.
 2. In July 2010, to support the H3 initiative, Glendale Housing implemented a preference for homeless single Glendale persons in our application and waiting list policy. If the preference requirements are met, single homeless Glendale persons will be assigned an additional preference point, which will effectively move them to the top of the waiting list. To qualify under this preference, the applicant must be under case management by an area agency serving the needs of homeless persons, and must be actively participating in their case management. Case management is the major component to the success of the individual by providing the ongoing and long-term support to ensure the person(s) can comply with the family obligations of the Section 8 program. As admission to the programs require certain verification documents, the case management agency will also assist the person to obtain proof of a social security number, birth certificate, etc. Glendale Community Housing Division has utilized all five vouchers dedicated to the H3 pilot program.
 3. HUD has issued Section 8 vouchers specifically for use by homeless veterans (VASH Vouchers). The veterans who receive assistance with VASH vouchers must be receiving case management administered by the VA. Currently, only the city of Phoenix and the State Housing Department have been issued VASH vouchers; however, veterans have full portability. Glendale is currently working with the VA to assist one veteran via portability to Glendale.

Emergency Solutions Grants (ESG)

1. Identify actions to address emergency shelter and transitional housing needs of homeless individuals and families (including significant subpopulations such as those living on the streets).
2. Assessment of Relationship of ESG Funds to Goals and Objectives
 - a. Evaluate progress made in using ESG funds to address homeless and homeless prevention needs, goals, and specific objectives established in the Consolidated Plan.

- b. Detail how ESG projects are related to implementation of comprehensive homeless planning strategy, including the number and types of individuals and persons in households served with ESG funds.
3. Matching Resources
 - a. Provide specific sources and amounts of new funding used to meet match as required by 42 USC 11375(a)(1), including cash resources, grants, and staff salaries, as well as in-kind contributions such as the value of a building or lease, donated materials, or volunteer time.
4. State Method of Distribution
 - a. States must describe their method of distribution and how it rated and selected its local government agencies and private nonprofit organizations acting as subrecipients.
5. Activity and Beneficiary Data
 - a. Completion of attached Emergency Shelter Grant Program Performance Chart or other reports showing ESGP expenditures by type of activity. Also describe any problems in collecting, reporting, and evaluating the reliability of this information.
 - b. Homeless Discharge Coordination
 - i. As part of the government developing and implementing a homeless discharge coordination policy, ESG homeless prevention funds may be used to assist very-low income individuals and families at risk of becoming homeless after being released from publicly funded institutions such as health care facilities, foster care or other youth facilities, or corrections institutions or programs.
 - c. Explain how your government is instituting a homeless discharge coordination policy, and how ESG homeless prevention funds are being used in this effort.

Program Year 2 CAPER ESG response:

As Glendale is an ESG entitlement community, below is a chart that demonstrates the match requirements that needed to be met during FY 2016-2017.

FY 2016-2017 ESG REQUIRED MATCH

AGENCY - ACTIVITY NAME	ESG FUNDS EXPENDED	SOURCE OF MATCHING FUNDS COMMITTED	AMOUNT OF MATCHING FUNDS COMMITTED	MATCHING REQUIREMENTS SATISFIED
A New Leaf - Faith House Emergency Shelter Operations	\$47,691	Agency Fund, Cash Resources	\$47,691	Yes
Street Light USA – Shelter Operations	\$10,232	Agency Fund, Volunteers	\$10,232	Yes
UMOM New Day Centers, Inc. – Emergency Shelter for Families	\$25,581	DES, United Way	\$25,581	Yes
A New Leaf - Rapid Re-housing	\$30,989	DES, Cash Resources	\$30,989	Yes
Central Arizona Shelter Services, Inc. - Rapid Re-housing	\$29,930	Valley of the Sun United Way	\$29,930	Yes
City of Glendale Community Action Program – Rapid Re-housing	\$1,951	General Fund	\$1,951	Yes

Glendale requires our subrecipients to provide the matching funds for the ESG funds passed through under contracts.

COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT

Community Development

1. Assessment of Relationship of CDBG Funds to Goals and Objectives
 - a. Assess use of CDBG funds in relation to the priorities, needs, goals, and specific objectives in the Consolidated Plan, particularly the highest priority activities.
 - b. Evaluate progress made toward meeting goals for providing affordable housing using CDBG funds, including the number and types of households served.
 - c. Indicate the extent to which CDBG funds were used for activities that benefited extremely low-income, low-income, and moderate-income persons.
2. Changes in Program Objectives
 - a. Identify the nature of and the reasons for any changes in program objectives and how the jurisdiction would change its program as a result of its experiences.
3. Assessment of Efforts in Carrying Out Planned Actions
 - a. Indicate how grantee pursued all resources indicated in the Consolidated Plan.
 - b. Indicate how grantee provided certifications of consistency in a fair and impartial manner.
 - c. Indicate how grantee did not hinder Consolidated Plan implementation by action or willful inaction.
4. For Funds Not Used for National Objectives
 - a. Indicate how use of CDBG funds did not meet national objectives.
 - b. Indicate how did not comply with overall benefit certification.
5. Anti-displacement and Relocation – for activities that involve acquisition, rehabilitation or demolition of occupied real property
 - a. Describe steps actually taken to minimize the amount of displacement resulting from the CDBG-assisted activities.
 - b. Describe steps taken to identify households, businesses, farms or nonprofit organizations who occupied properties subject to the Uniform Relocation Act or Section 104(d) of the Housing and Community Development Act of 1974, as amended, and whether or not they were displaced, and the nature of their needs and preferences.
 - c. Describe steps taken to ensure the timely issuance of information notices to displaced households, businesses, farms, or nonprofit organizations.
6. Low/Mod Job Activities – for economic development activities undertaken where jobs were made available but not taken by low- or moderate-income persons
 - a. Describe actions taken by grantee and businesses to ensure first consideration was or will be given to low/mod persons.
 - b. List by job title of all the permanent jobs created/retained and those that were made available to low/mod persons.
 - c. If any of jobs claimed as being available to low/mod persons require special skill, work experience, or education, provide a description of steps being taken or that will be taken to provide such skills, experience, or education.

7. Low/Mod Limited Clientele Activities – for activities not falling within one of the categories of presumed limited clientele low and moderate income benefit
 - a. Describe how the nature, location, or other information demonstrates the activities benefit a limited clientele at least 51% of whom are low- and moderate-income.
8. Program income received
 - a. Detail the amount of program income reported that was returned to each individual revolving fund, e.g., housing rehabilitation, economic development, or other type of revolving fund.
 - b. Detail the amount repaid on each float-funded activity.
 - c. Detail all other loan repayments broken down by the categories of housing rehabilitation, economic development, or other.
 - d. Detail the amount of income received from the sale of property by parcel.
9. Prior period adjustments – where reimbursement was made this reporting period for expenditures (made in previous reporting periods) that have been disallowed, provide the following information:
 - a. The activity name and number as shown in IDIS;
 - b. The program year(s) in which the expenditure(s) for the disallowed activity(ies) was reported;
 - c. The amount returned to line-of-credit or program account; and
 - d. Total amount to be reimbursed and the time period over which the reimbursement is to be made, if the reimbursement is made with multi-year payments.
10. Loans and other receivables
 - a. List the principal balance for each float-funded activity outstanding as of the end of the reporting period and the date(s) by which the funds are expected to be received.
 - b. List the total number of other loans outstanding and the principal balance owed as of the end of the reporting period.
 - c. List separately the total number of outstanding loans that are deferred or forgivable, the principal balance owed as of the end of the reporting period, and the terms of the deferral or forgiveness.
 - d. Detail the total number and amount of loans made with CDBG funds that have gone into default and for which the balance was forgiven or written off during the reporting period.
 - e. Provide a List of the parcels of property owned by the grantee or its subrecipients that have been acquired or improved using CDBG funds and that are available for sale as of the end of the reporting period.
11. Lump sum agreements
 - a. Provide the name of the financial institution.
 - b. Provide the date the funds were deposited.
 - c. Provide the date the use of funds commenced.
 - d. Provide the percentage of funds disbursed within 180 days of deposit in the institution.
12. Housing Rehabilitation – for each type of rehabilitation program for which projects/units were reported as completed during the program year
 - a. Identify the type of program and number of projects/units completed for each program.
 - b. Provide the total CDBG funds involved in the program.
 - c. Detail other public and private funds involved in the project.

13. Neighborhood Revitalization Strategies – for grantees that have HUD-approved neighborhood revitalization strategies
- Describe progress against benchmarks for the program year. For grantees with Federally-designated EZs or ECs that received HUD approval for a neighborhood revitalization strategy, reports that are required as part of the EZ/EC process shall suffice for purposes of reporting progress.

Program Year 2 CAPER Community Development response:

Please see the Community Development Needs table that appears in the last section of the City of Glendale’s Five-Year Consolidated Plan FY 2015-2019. Because the table is limited in its ability to link Glendale’s Strategic Plan and Action Plan specific goals and objectives, a separate table appears at the end of the Action Plan which better demonstrates how Glendale has achieved its goals.

FIVE-YEAR COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT PLAN GOALS AND OBJECTIVES

STRATEGY 1: IMPROVE AND MAINTAIN THE CITY’S NEIGHBORHOODS

Goal 1: Rehabilitate single-family properties owned by special needs and low- and moderate-income households.

Goal 2: Improve qualifying neighborhoods through infrastructure improvements such as streetscaping, traffic calming, streetlights, landscaping, and similar activities.

Goal 3: Facilitate the development of infill housing and encourage mixed-income opportunities.

Goal 4: Facilitate the demolition and/or clearance of substandard structures to allow for future development benefiting low- to moderate-income households.

Goal 5: Facilitate commercial revitalization and adaptive reuse of commercial properties, with a potential for a mixed-income housing component.

STRATEGY 2: PROVIDE HOUSING ASSISTANCE AND SUPPORTIVE SERVICES TO THE CITY’S SPECIAL NEEDS POPULATIONS

Goal 1: Provide supportive services to at-risk youth and youth who have been abused and neglected, as well as health care and juvenile offender programs.

Goal 2: Provide home and community based services to seniors and persons with disabilities (i.e., respite programs for caregivers, food assistance, and accessibility programs).

Goal 3: Assist with operational and capital expenses of non-profit organizations serving persons with special needs.

Goal 4: Support referral and informational services that provide information to persons with special needs and low- to moderate-income households.

STRATEGY 3: INCREASE EMPLOYMENT OPPORTUNITIES / BUSINESS DEVELOPMENT FOR THE CITY’S ELIGIBLE RESIDENTS

Goal 1: Partner with existing non-profits for capacity building, technical assistance (i.e., public-non-profit partnership models) and assist with facility planning.

Goal 2: Support workforce development by partnering with non-profit providers of affordable, quality child/adult day care.

Goal 3: Partner with economic development non-profits to promote job skills development training for unemployed and underemployed qualifying residents and explore microenterprise assistance.

Goal 4: Partner with existing agencies to create employment opportunities for low- and moderate-income individuals by facilitating commercial revitalization and adaptive reuse of commercial properties.

Please see the last six paragraphs at the end of "Specific Housing Objectives" section under "HOUSING", and the "LEVERAGING RESOURCES" table in the Executive Summary, Item 5 for available resources used by Glendale to achieve the goals and objectives identified above.

During the grant application process, subrecipients attend an orientation seminar designed to provide technical assistance in developing successful grant applications. In addition, regulatory requirements of the CDBG, ESG, and HOME program are discussed at this orientation seminar. Ongoing, informal technical assistance and "desktop" monitoring supplements the training provided during orientation.

As appropriate, intake forms or surveys of agency clients are completed to identify the income level and residence location of the clientele. Results are compiled and analyzed to insure that qualified clients are being served at a level within the requirements established by HUD. Reporting is required by contract, and reviews are performed by staff.

Three types of loans are made available as part of the City of Glendale single-family residential rehabilitation (CDBG or HOME) and replacement housing (HOME) programs: direct payment, forgivable (a.k.a.principal reduction), and recoverable-deferred. They are funded in conjunction with the HUD programs during the period of affordability, and liens are placed on the properties until they reach term, or the home is sold. If sold, the unamortized portion of forgivable loans is recovered as program income, as are the direct payment loan balances and recoverable-deferred amounts. Program income may also be produced by payoff of loans when owners replaced them with new financing.

Below is a table that aggregates the outstanding loans by type (direct payment, forgivable, or recoverable-deferred), as of June 30, 2017:

<u>CDBG</u>	
Direct Payment	\$434,587
Forgivable:	
7-Year	\$8,310
10-Year	0
15-Year	\$423,317
20-Year	\$854,959
Total Forgivable	\$ 1,721,174
Recoverable-Deferred	\$ 68,000
Total CDBG Loans Outstanding	\$1,789,174
 <u>HOME</u>	
Direct Payment	\$151,891
Forgivable:	
7-Year	\$10,409
15-Year	\$267,586
20-Year	\$650,651
30-Year	\$682,718
Total Forgivable	\$1,763,255
Recoverable-Deferred	\$837,765

Total HOME Loans Outstanding

\$2,601,020

Also, the OBJECTIVES AND OUTCOMES table (Exhibit 1, attached) details the goals proposed and completed, as well as the dollar amounts committed and expended for each of these resources used for this purpose.

Antipoverty Strategy

1. Describe actions taken during the last year to reduce the number of persons living below the poverty level.

Program Year 2 CAPER Antipoverty Strategy response:

The City of Glendale continues its commitment to provide its lowest income residents with quality housing, in addition to helping these residents move out of poverty and become self-sufficient. Glendale's numerous housing and community development programs are targeted to improving the housing and neighborhood conditions of low-income residents. In addition, Glendale funds activities directly related to reducing poverty by providing emergency assistance, self-sufficiency programs, youth programs - including those that target youth who are at risk of poverty to help them make the right choices for their futures, and supportive services. During FY 2016-2017, the city provided funding to the following organizations as part of its anti-poverty efforts:

Central Arizona Shelter Services (CASS) – One of the outcomes of providing shelter services to homeless men and women is that they can receive supportive services to help them seek and obtain employment at a livable wage. This agency also has a job development service and includes skills assessment, job-readiness training, employment support groups, and access to job search tools.

A New Leaf – While providing shelter services to women who have become homeless through domestic violence, beneficiaries are granted services that assist with basic needs, child care services, skills training, regaining permanent housing through rental assistance, and other support services, increasing the likelihood that these women and children will live free from family violence by providing a safe environment where they can develop the skills and access the resources needed to become empowered, self-sufficient members of the community.

Glendale works closely with its Public Housing Authority, developers of affordable housing in Glendale, providers of supportive services, and Maricopa County jurisdictions to ensure that funds are used efficiently and are well-targeted to poverty reduction efforts.

The OBJECTIVES AND OUTCOMES table (Exhibit 1, attached) details the goals proposed and completed, as well as the dollar amounts committed and expended for each of these resources, as well as others used for this purpose.

NON-HOMELESS SPECIAL NEEDS

Non-homeless Special Needs

1. Identify actions taken to address special needs of persons that are not homeless but require supportive housing, (including persons with HIV/AIDS and their families).

Program Year 2 CAPER Non-homeless Special Needs response:

Below is the Non-Homeless Special Needs table that appears in the CPMP Tool provided to HUD.

Non-Homeless Special Needs Including HOPWA		Needs	Currently Available	GAP										
					Year 1		Year 2		Year 3		Year 4		Year 5	
					Goal	Complete	Goal	Complete	Goal	Complete	Goal	Complete	Goal	Complete
Housing Needed	52. Elderly	1,350	0		270	352	250	341	0	0	0	0	0	0
	53. Frail Elderly	1,680	0		336	352	320	300	0	0	0	0	0	0
	54. Persons w/ Severe Mental Illness	1,200	0		240	94	215	106	0	0	0	0	0	0
	55. Developmentally Disabled	N/A	0		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	56. Physically Disabled	563	0		113	131	100	126	0	0	0	0	0	0
	57. Alcohol/Other Drug Addicted	2,500	0		500	0	500	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	58. Persons w/ HIV/AIDS & their families	475	0		95	0	90	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	59. Public Housing Residents	155	0		31	28	30	10	0	0	0	0	0	0
	Total	7,923	0		1,585	957	1505	883	0	0	0	0	0	0
		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Supportive Services Needed	60. Elderly	N/A	0			0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	61. Frail Elderly	N/A	0			0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	62. Persons w/ Severe Mental Illness	N/A	0			0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	63. Developmentally Disabled	1688	0		338	117	300	112	0	0	0	0	0	0
	64. Physically Disabled	N/A	0			0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	65. Alcohol/Other Drug Addicted	N/A	0			0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	66. Persons w/ HIV/AIDS & their families	N/A	0			0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	67. Public Housing Residents	0	0			0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	Total	1,688	0		338	117	30	112	0	0	0	0	0	0

Specific HOPWA Objectives

1. Overall Assessment of Relationship of HOPWA Funds to Goals and Objectives
Grantees should demonstrate through the CAPER and related IDIS reports the progress they are making at accomplishing identified goals and objectives with HOPWA funding. Grantees should demonstrate:
 - a. That progress is being made toward meeting the HOPWA goal for providing affordable housing using HOPWA funds and other resources for persons with HIV/AIDS and their families through a comprehensive community plan;
 - b. That community-wide HIV/AIDS housing strategies are meeting HUD's national goal of increasing the availability of decent, safe, and affordable housing for low-income persons living with HIV/AIDS;
 - c. That community partnerships between State and local governments and community-based non-profits are creating models and innovative strategies to serve the housing and related supportive service needs of persons living with HIV/AIDS and their families;
 - d. That through community-wide strategies Federal, State, local, and other resources are matched with HOPWA funding to create comprehensive housing strategies;
 - e. That community strategies produce and support actual units of housing for persons living with HIV/AIDS; and finally,
 - f. Those community strategies identify and supply related supportive services in conjunction with housing to ensure the needs of persons living with HIV/AIDS and their families are met.
2. This should be accomplished by providing an executive summary (1-5 pages) that includes:
 - a. Grantee Narrative
 - i. Grantee and Community Overview
 - (1) A brief description of your organization, the area of service, the name of each project sponsor and a broad overview of the range/type of housing activities and related services
 - (2) How grant management oversight of project sponsor activities is conducted and how project sponsors are selected
 - (3) A description of the local jurisdiction, its need, and the estimated number of persons living with HIV/AIDS
 - (4) A brief description of the planning and public consultations involved in the use of HOPWA funds including reference to any appropriate planning document or advisory body
 - (5) What other resources were used in conjunction with HOPWA funded activities, including cash resources and in-kind contributions, such as the value of services or materials provided by volunteers or by other individuals or organizations
 - (6) Collaborative efforts with related programs including coordination and planning with clients, advocates, Ryan White CARE Act planning bodies, AIDS Drug Assistance Programs, homeless assistance programs, or other efforts that assist persons living with HIV/AIDS and their families.
 - ii. Project Accomplishment Overview
 - (1) A brief summary of all housing activities broken down by three types: emergency or short-term rent, mortgage or utility payments to prevent homelessness; rental assistance; facility based housing, including development cost, operating cost for those facilities and community residences
 - (2) The number of units of housing which have been created through acquisition, rehabilitation, or new construction since 1993 with any HOPWA funds

- (3) A brief description of any unique supportive service or other service delivery models or efforts
 - (4) Any other accomplishments recognized in your community due to the use of HOPWA funds, including any projects in developmental stages that are not operational.
- iii. Barriers or Trends Overview
 - (1) Describe any barriers encountered, actions in response to barriers, and recommendations for program improvement
 - (2) Trends you expect your community to face in meeting the needs of persons with HIV/AIDS, and
 - (3) Any other information you feel may be important as you look at providing services to persons with HIV/AIDS in the next 5-10 years
- b. Accomplishment Data
 - i. Completion of CAPER Performance Chart 1 of Actual Performance in the provision of housing (Table II-1 to be submitted with CAPER).
 - ii. Completion of CAPER Performance Chart 2 of Comparison to Planned Housing Actions (Table II-2 to be submitted with CAPER).

Program Year 2 CAPER Specific HOPWA Objectives response:

N/A for the City of Glendale, Arizona

OTHER NARRATIVE

Include any CAPER information that was not covered by narratives in any other section.

Program Year 2 CAPER Other Narrative response:

The following reports are herein included by reference and are electronically available to the U. S. Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD) through IDIS, HUD's Integrated Disbursement and Information System. Hard copies are available for review at the City of Glendale Community Revitalization office at 5850 West Glendale Avenue, Suite #107, Glendale, AZ.

- 1. Grant Summary of Accomplishments Report (CO4PR23)
- 2. Consolidated Annual Performance and Evaluation Report (CO4PRO26)
- 3. Grant Summary of Activities (CO4PR03)

The CAPER narrative includes references to a number of other documents that are available for public review during business hours from 8:00 a.m. to 5:00 p.m., Monday through Friday, at the City of Glendale Community Revitalization office at 5850 West Glendale Avenue, Suite #107, Glendale, AZ 85301. These documents include:

- Five-Year Consolidated Plan
- Analysis of Impediments to Fair Housing Choice
- Annual Action Plans
- Consolidated Annual Performance and Evaluation Reports
- Projects Tables
- Specific Objectives

The following reports are also available for review at the Maricopa HOME Consortium office at the Security Building, 234 North Central Avenue, 3rd Floor, Phoenix, AZ 85004:

- Maricopa County HOME Consortium CAPER
- HOME Annual Report (Form HUD 40107) – including back-up documentation

HOME Match Report (Form HUD 40107-A) – including back-up documentation



City of Glendale
Community Revitalization Division
5850 W. Glendale Avenue, Suite 107
Glendale, AZ 85301

www.glendaleaz.com/communitypartnerships/communityrevitalization.cfm.



Phone (623) 930-3670
Fax (623) 435-8594
AZ Relay Service Number 711

